

#6  
2/9/2000  
amw

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hanratty et al

Docket: TI-25277

Serial No.: 09/092,115



Art Unit: 2823

Filed: 06/05/98

Examiner: Hawranek

For: Antireflective Structure and Method

AMENDMENT AND/OR ARGUMENT

Assistant Commissioner  
for Patents  
Box NonFee Amendment  
Washington, DC 20231

MAILING CERTIFICATE	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 today.	
<i>Gracia Sansom</i> Gracia Sansom	<i>1-18-2000</i> Date

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed 09/15/99, applicants hereby petition for an extension of time in which to respond (separate petition enclosed) and ARGUE as follows.

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application; and all claims have been rejected. Reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

Claims 1-3 were rejected as unpatentable over Auda in view of Wolf. The Examiner asserted that Auda shows isotropic photoresist linewidth reduction for etching gates, that Wolf shows photoresist without linewidth reduction for etching interconnects over gates, and that Auda would inherently use Wolf to complete a device.

Applicants reply that Auda would inherently apply the same photoresist linewidth reduction to the interconnect formation as to the gates. Indeed, the point of the photoresist linewidth reduction is to achieve linewidths less than direct photolithography can yield. The references fail to suggest such a use of both reduced and nonreduced linewidths.